

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, January 28, 2008**

1. CONVENE: 7:01 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board Member Cunningham.
3. ROLL CALL: President Cook, Vice President Kohlstrand, Board Members Cunningham, and Ezzy Ashcraft.

Board Members Lynch and McNamara were absent from roll call.

Also present were Planning and Building Director Cathy Woodbury, Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Farimah Faiz, Planner III Doug Garrison, Planner III Dennis Brighton.

4. MINUTES:
 - a. Minutes for the meeting of November 13, 2007 (Not available)
 - b. Minutes for the meeting of November 26, 2007 (continued from 1/14/08).

Board member Cunningham moved to approve the minutes of November 26, 2007, as amended.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4.
Absent: 2 (Lynch, Mariani)

- c. Minutes for the meeting of December 10, 2007.

There was not a quorum for these minutes.

- d. Minutes for the meeting of January 14, 2008.

There was not a quorum for these minutes.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Future Agendas

Mr. Thomas provided an update on future agenda items.

- b. Zoning Administrator Report – Meeting of January 22, 2008.

Mr. Thomas provided the Zoning Administrator report.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION: None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

8-A. **PLN-0076 – Yi Lim Han – 2323 Santa Clara Avenue.** The applicant proposes to use the existing commercial space on the second floor at 2323 Santa Clara Avenue, Unit A-2, for a Day Spa. The proposed Day Spa will offer pedicures and manicures, facials, and foot and whole body massage as an accessory use. The Day Spa will likely have thirteen to nineteen customers a day and approximately five employees. The Day Spa will have two nail (pedicure & manicure) stations, two massage stations and two facial stations, one office, and one restroom. Pursuant to Alameda Municipal Code 30-4.9A.c(q) a Use Permit is required for a Day Space in a C-C-T, Community Commercial Theater District. (SW)

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Draft Planning Board Resolution to approve the use of the existing commercial space on the second floor at 2323 Santa Clara Avenue, Unit A-2, for a Day Spa. The proposed Day Spa will offer pedicures and manicures, facials, and foot and whole body massage as an accessory use. The Day Spa will likely have thirteen to nineteen customers a day and approximately five employees. The Day Spa will have two nail (pedicure & manicure) stations, two massage stations and two facial stations, one office, and one restroom. Pursuant to Alameda Municipal Code 30-4.9A.c(q) a Use Permit is required for a Day Space in a C-C-T, Community Commercial Theater District.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: 2 (Lynch, McNamara). The motion passed.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

9-A. **Approve a Change in the Format for a Future Public Forum Regarding the Housing Element and Measure A (Continued from January 14, 2008) (CW)**

Ms. Woodbury presented the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that one condition directed staff to provide a list of four to six panelists for each panel. She would be comfortable to leave the number of panelists to the discretion of staff and the consultants. She was neutral on whether breakout groups would be included or not.

Vice President Kohlstrand agreed with Board member Ezzy Ashcraft's comments, and was open to having between four to six panelists; four panelists should be a minimum. She was also open to having the small group forums.

Board member Cunningham inquired how the panelists were coached toward a discussion, and believed that the panel discussion should be structured correctly to get the most out of the discussion. He believed there should be a minimum of four panelists. He wished to emphasize that there would be ample opportunity for the public to provide input at this forum. He believed it would be useful to have data on the existing housing stock in the City in order to have baseline data.

Ms. Woodbury believed that staff would be able to provide that information.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that 50 percent of both panels would be composed of community members. She believed it would be a well-rounded discussion with sufficient time for public comment.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham whether there would be a formal role for the Planning Board, Ms. Woodbury replied that she would return to the Board with that information. She will pose that question to the consultant team.

Board member Cunningham noted that he was not looking for any active participation.

President Cook wished to clarify that there would be an opportunity for both public questioning of the panelists, and an hour-and-a-half at the end of the forum for public comment. She noted that the small group format was an additional way to generate public comment.

Ms. Woodbury noted that this forum would be noticed as a special meeting of the Planning Board since a quorum would be present.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Kohlstrand whether former Planning Director Colette Meunier would be available for the forum, Ms. Woodbury replied that she would not be, but that Hanson Hom would be available.

President Cook wanted to ensure that neither Ms. Meunier nor Mr. Hom were strongly in one camp or another. Ms. Woodbury assured the Board that would not be the case.

Board member Cunningham moved to approve a Change in the Format for a Future Public Forum Regarding the Housing Element and Measure A.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: 2 (Lynch, McNamara). The motion passed.

9-B. V07-0006 (Variances) and DR07-0056 (Major Design Review) – Donna Talbot and James Rauk – 3327 Fernside Blvd. The applicant requests variances to allow the following exceptions to the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC): 1) Proposed main building exceeds maximum permitted building height (AMC, Subsection 30-4.3(d)(4)); 2) Proposed boathouse/accessory building exceeds maximum height, required rear yard coverage, and building area standards (AMC, Subsection 30-5.7(f); 3) Proposed driveway exceeds maximum permitted driveway width (AMC, Subsection 30-7.9(f)(1)(b)). The Major Design Review addresses: 1) Raising the residential structure by three feet to create a third story and providing an addition at the rear of the residence; 2) Constructing a two-story boathouse/accessory building. The site is located within an R-2, Two-family Residential Zoning District. (DB).

Mr. Brighton summarized the staff report. Staff noted that it was not able to find any extraordinary circumstances applying to the property, physical constraints to the parcel, unnecessary hardship or deprivation of a property right because there were other design options that were permitted. Staff was unable to make the finding that granting the variance would not be a detriment to the neighborhood. Because staff was unable to make the findings for a variance and design review approval, and recommended that Planning Board deny the proposed variance application and design review application.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham whether the construction of the dock was part of the application, Mr. Brighton replied that it was on City right of way, and that the provision of a dock was approved at the building permit level, providing they meet BCDC and Army Corps of Engineers Requirements. He noted that was not under discussion this evening. Staff recommended that the clients go to BCDC and the Army Corps of Engineers before they start planning for dock expansion. If the Planning Board were to approve the entire project, it would be a boiler plate condition.

President Cook noted that five speaker slips had been received, and polled the Board whether comments should be limited to three minutes.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft preferred to keep the comments to five minutes because of the significance of the subject.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Elizabeth Kraise, AAPS, noted that they had submitted an email on January 24, 2008. She noted that AAPS opposed granting a variance to allow the house to be jacked up, and that raising it three feet violated the Golden Mean ratio. They also believed that the house would loom over most of the adjacent buildings on the street, and be out of proportion with the neighborhood. The wider garage would mean moving the front steps to the side, which would further erode the architectural integrity of the Craftsman Bungalow design, which

was also meant to be low to the ground. They believed it was a bad precedent to allow exceptions to the Golden Mean and to the Guide to Residential Design.

Ms. Joanne Chandler spoke in support of this project. She noted that she owned the property adjacent to the subject site. She did not believe there would be an adverse impact on her property, and supported the variance.

Ms. Seth Amalian spoke in support of this project, and noted that he and his wife lived two doors to the southeast from the subject site. He did not believe they needed protection from the proposed project, and believed it was consistent with the already existing scale and mass of the home. He noted that it was already in imposing structure, but in a positive way; he believed it was attractive. He noted that it already had three stories, and that the increase was three feet, which would make it a more usable space. He noted that the peak of the roof barely crept over the height limit. He noted that this house already had mass, and that the proposed changes would be consistent. He believed that in his neighborhood, investment by the property owners would be necessary as the homes age. He believed that when the changes were thoughtful and in keeping with the home's character, it would be acceptable. He noted that this house was not a low-slung bungalow.

Ms. Patricia Plowman spoke in support of this project. She noted that she lived next door to the applicants, and noted that she had two single-family homes on her lot. She noted that many of the homes in the neighborhood had been built in the 1930s, and that many needed updating and upgrading. She noted that she submitted a letter to the Planning Board.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft disclosed that she visited the property.

Ms. Donna Talbot, applicant, distributed an exhibit to the Board and noted that their home was not on the historic list. She added that they endeavored to include as many Craftsman elements as possible. She was very disturbed by what she had read in the staff report and the AAPS letter, which both used the phrase "Craftsman Bungalow." She noted that the Alameda Residential Design Guidelines included a glossary that defined the architecture styles in Alameda. She noted that the example Craftsman house was somewhat smaller than their house; the example Craftsman Bungalow was a much smaller one-story home. She noted that their house was a large Craftsman house, not a bungalow. She noted that the two examples of Craftsman homes in Alameda were low one-story homes that did not have front entries. She noted that there were many things that could be done with a Craftsman house, and that they had worked very hard with their architect to preserve those qualities. She noted that the AAPS had commented that they planned to reduce the front porch to create a front stoop; she noted that they would double the size of the porch. She noted that the staff report and the AAPS letter discussed a side stair, and added that they still had a front step going up to the house; it was moved to the side and put a turn in it so it would not appear to be one long staircase.

Ms. Talbot displayed several photos of the site on the overhead screen. She noted that they had discussed implementing changes from the staff report in order to provide a balance between their creative desires and what staff requires. They proposed to reduce the height by

one foot so that the variance for the peak of the roof would be 9 inches. They would like to recharacterize the boat house as a second home so that the boat house would not be an accessory structure; she noted that the Alameda Municipal Code did not have any regulations with respect to boat houses. She noted that they would shift it back three feet to meet the requirements, and to meet the side setback requirements of five feet. She noted that they would like to put all their vehicles into garage, so they would not be on the street. With respect to the dock, she noted that before they approached BCDC, she understood that they must get the approval from the Planning Board.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham regarding the impetus behind adding the extra 9 inches of height, Ms. Talbot replied that their driveway was not below the street grade. She noted that there was no drainage along the street, and if they excavated rather than going up, the water from the street will drain towards their house. Mr. Rauk added that they were almost level with the street at this time.

President Cook noted that it was unusual for the Planning Board to be asked to review a project that they did not have before them. She noted that it was unusual to have so many changes, and not have the project to review.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff did not have the plans, but believed their description of changing the boat house to a main dwelling, and to meet those setbacks, would avoid the variances related to the boat house. He believed staff could revisit the driveway variance. He noted the height variance was still unresolved, and would like more feedback from the Planning Board whether the findings for that variance could be made. He suggested that the Board direct the applicants to redesign the drawings along the lines of what had been discussed. If the Board was comfortable with the 9-inch variance, staff would bring revised plans and a revised resolution with appropriate findings back to the Planning Board for reconsideration.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft expressed concern that applicants seemed to be forced to apply for something they did not want; she believed they wanted a boat house. She appreciated the time and effort put into the staff report, and requested that when numerous Code sections were cited, that they be attached to the staff report. She would also like the significant documents to be attached as well, such as the letter from staff from June 28, 2007, which was paraphrased in the applicants' letter. She observed that the definition for an accessory building did not cover a boat house, and believed that it should be defined, especially in an island community. Mr. Brighton noted that a boat house is defined in the Code, and that it is defined as an "detached accessory structure." He added that a boat house was a garage for a boat.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Board could initiate a Zoning Code Amendment to create a definition for a boat house, which would have a different set of requirements than an accessory structure.

President Cook suggested that 1,000 square feet should be the dividing line between a boat house and an actual dwelling.

Mr. Thomas noted that may be an argument for the applicants' approach, which was to call it a main house. He noted that the parcel was large enough, the setback requirements could be made, and it remained to be seen whether the open space and parking requirements could be met. The applicants could request that the Board initiate a Zoning Text Amendment along those lines, which would then be considered by the City Council.

Vice President Kohlstrand believed the rear structure was consistent with everything else in the area, and she had seen many two-story boat houses all along the waterfront. She believed a Code Amendment may not be finished in time to solve the applicants' problem, but that it was something that could be considered.

Mr. Thomas noted that there were many Code violations along the waterfront, which had been very problematic to enforce.

President Cook generally agreed with staff's analysis about variances, which are difficult to make the findings for.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that some of the nicest homes she has seen have had some kind of renovation that displayed a seamless look. She wanted to ensure that the regulations would not penalize people or prevent them from doing things that would be to the betterment of the entire community, not just their property. She would be open to dealing with the existence of boat houses from a Code point of view. She supposed people being able to improve their properties, but believed there should be some reward for undertaking a project such as this that would improve the entire street. With respect to the center porch being more welcoming, most of the entrances along that stretch of Fernside were off-center as well. She noted that the cover of the City's Guide to Residential Design did not show a single centered entrance. She submitted that an off-center porch could be welcoming as well.

Mr. Thomas invited Board comments regarding their thoughts about a variance on the front house for height, the overall quality of the architectural design; and the Board's thoughts on initiating a Zoning Text Amendment to examine boat houses. Staff would then be able to discuss the phasing of the project with the applicants; perhaps the front house could be addressed first, while the Text Amendment followed.

Board member Cunningham could not find a compelling reason to raise the building nine inches, and the existing base slab was still 10 inches above the road. He believed that by massaging grades on the driveway, it would be possible to mitigate any drainage problems. He suggested adding a drainage system around the foundation, given the site's proximity to the Estuary. He did not see any reason to support a variance for a nine-inch height increase. He did not have a problem with raising it to 30 feet. He appreciated AAPS's comments about preserving the integrity of the building, but he found the cut-in driveway to be more oppressive than the open driveway that was proposed. He would like to see some

architectural relief to the front elevation and the high wall in front. He liked the changes to the garage door. He did not believe the boat house design was objectionable; he believed it was more of a Code issue. He was mindful of trying to get too much density on the lot, as well as pushing the dock too far toward the water.

Board member Cunningham liked the use of boats in a waterfront area, which should be encouraged because it activated the waterfront. He was concerned about people building too far into the Estuary.

Vice President Kohlstrand encouraged staff to include more detail in the staff report because of the complexity of this project. She echoed Board member Cunningham's comments, and she did not have an issue with the boat house; she wanted to take into account the two-story structures on the rear of the property. She understood that the legal requirements of the variance, but did not think the proposed scale in the rear of the property was out of scale with the adjacent structures. She had some concerns about a height variance, and had not seen one in her three years on the Board. She agreed that the blank façade on the front of the house was overwhelming, and would like that to be treated. She liked the design of the garage doors.

With respect to the boat house, Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that it was important to remember that the applicants bought a waterfront property, and that it was not unreasonable to expect that they would want to make use of the waterfront behind their home. She agreed that the structure as designed would be one of the more attractive structures on the back of Fernside Blvd.

President Cook generally agreed with the Board's comments, and commended the applicants on the amount of work they had done on their home. Her main concern about the design was that the area around the garage felt heavy to her. She would like the amount of concrete to be limited, and for the massing to be broken up. She believed the issue of height was more critical than the number of floors, and encouraged the applicants to stay within the height limits as much as possible. She noted that the parking requirements would need to be addressed. She understood the applicants' conflict since they were trying to build a smaller structure, while the Code seemed to be pushing them towards a larger structure. She noted that the issues of density and the public rights to the waterfront were important issues.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that there were pavers available that allowed grass to grow between them.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff would regroup with the applicant and examine the scenarios for the main house, back house, and parking open space requirements.

Board member Cunningham moved to continue this item to February 25, 2008.

Vice President Kohlstrand seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: 2 (Lynch, McNamara). The motion passed.

9-C. City of Alameda General Plan Retail Policy Amendments – Applicant – City of Alameda.. The Planning Board will consider a General Plan Amendment to amend Section 2.5 Retail Business and Services, to add and modify policies as recommended by the Alameda Citywide Retail Policy Report. The proposed amendments would affect all properties in non-residential zoning districts and mixed use zoning districts.

Mr. Thomas presented the staff report, noting that Item 9-D was the companion item to Item 9-C. He noted that no additional community comment had been received on this item since the last meeting. Staff referenced the need to balance the needs of adjacent residential areas with respect to reduced parking requirements, which could be stated in the policy or the explanatory text.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers slips.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Cunningham noted that the minutes from the previous meeting referenced discussion about the concept of parking at the side of retail areas, as well as the pros and cons of pushing the parking to the back. He found that items 2.5.e and 2.5.s were in conflict with each other, regarding the use of the ground floor for office space.

Board member Cunningham noted that 2.5.l, reading “New commercial retail development on the waterfront should be consistent with best practices for waterfront orientated development,” and inquired whether there was a definition of those best practices.

Mr. Thomas replied that in the Northern Waterfront General Plan Amendment, which was adopted in the General Plan, there was more specific guidance on public access along the waterfront, attractive façades from the street and waterfront sides, and activities both day and night. This was moved to the Urban Design section of the General Plan, so it would apply to all development. Staff could amend the language by referencing that language. He agreed that there should be more specificity.

Board member Cunningham referenced 2.5.n, which discussed building heights “to maintain the historic open form and character of Park Street and Webster Street business districts, limit building heights on both the streets to three stories above grade, measuring 35 to 40 feet, depending on roof configuration. Parking structure ought to be limited by height only.” He inquired whether 40 feet was the height limit. Mr. Thomas confirmed that the height limit was 40 feet, and noted that policy was already in the General Plan.

President Cook suggested that the wording “40 feet, regardless of the number of levels” be included.

Board member Cunningham concurred with that suggestion.

Board member Cunningham noted that 2.5.o, which would “reduce the extent of neighborhood business districts by redesignating residential parcel zone for commercial use to residential use,” and inquired whether that was counter to the Board’s efforts to introduce local neighborhood stores and encourage pedestrian retail, rather than turning commercial space back into residential space.

Mr. Thomas noted that had been unchanged since the 1991 General Plan, and noted that much of that had been done already.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft believed it was important to maintain the balance of the housing and commercial uses because it would preserve the housing stock, and it would reduce auto trips. She did not want to see an area where every former house became some form of a business, which would eliminate the neighborhood business district. She believed the wording was cumbersome, verging on misleading.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Board could direct staff to rewrite that policy to reflect Board member Ezzy Ashcraft’s comments, which would ensure that the Zoning Map and the General Plan reflected the land uses and building types. He noted that staff could also remove that section of text.

Board member Cunningham suggested that with respect to 2.5.u, that an item be introduced that discussed the integration of utility and trash enclosures to these types of environments in a positive way. He would like those uses to be screened from public view, and kept out of main pedestrian pathways.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that recycling enclosures be included.

Vice President Kohlstrand complimented staff on integrating the Board’s extensive comments into the document. She noted that 2.5.b contained an extra word. She noted that the extra “be” should be deleted.

Vice President Kohlstrand shared the other Board members’ concerns about 2.5.o. She noted that the second sentence in 2.5.r should read, “Encourage construction of multilevel parking *and shared* parking in shopping centers.”

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that with respect to the third item in 2.5.u, she was unsure whether it was appropriate to say that there should be minimum use of the major drive aisles for internal automobile circulation. She noted that there was no other way for cars to circulate without using the major drive aisles. She suggested striking the language “and minimum use.”

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the word “isle” should be corrected to read “aisle” at the bottom of page 5. She concurred with the other comments.

Board member Cunningham noted that the contradictory language he had been searching for was “Transit use can be encouraged by providing bus shelters by locating store entrances on the street with parking at the side and rear, and by charging for parking,” and “the retail frontage should not be interrupted.”

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the concept of in lieu fees was to use the funds to improve the business districts, as opposed to going back into the general fund. She realized it was allowed by using the word “could,” but would prefer using the word “should.” She commended Mr. Thomas and staff in integrating the volume of detail into this document.

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Draft Planning Board Resolution to approve a General Plan Amendment to amend Section 2.5 Retail Business and Services, to add and modify policies as recommended by the Alameda Citywide Retail Policy Report. The proposed amendments would affect all properties in non-residential zoning districts and mixed use zoning districts. The following modifications and clarification would be included:

1. “New commercial retail development should be consistent with best practices of waterfront oriented developments, such as public access along the water, attractive architecture facing the water, and to the extent feasible, a mix of uses oriented to the water.”;
2. The noted typos would be corrected;
3. 2.5.1 will be revised as noted;
4. 2.5.n (parking structure height) will be revised as noted;
5. 2.5.o will be stricken entirely;
6. Parking would be added to 2.5.r;
7. Language addressing minimizing the potential negative impacts of overflow parking on neighbors will be added;
8. The reference to side parking will be stricken; and language recommending the minimizing of curb cuts should be added; and
9. 2.5.u.3: The last phrase will be stricken.

Vice President Kohlstrand seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: 2 (Lynch, McNamara). The motion passed.

9-D. Large Format Retail Store Zoning Text Amendments – Applicant – City of Alameda. The Planning Board will consider proposed zoning text amendments to the Alameda Municipal Code related to large format retail stores and the location of retail uses throughout Alameda. The proposed text amendments include a definition of large format retail store and proposed provisions requiring a use permit for different types of retail uses in certain zoning districts. The proposed amendments would affect all properties in non-residential zoning districts and mixed use zoning districts. (DG)

Mr. Garrison presented the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers slips.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that she was comfortable with staff's recommendations regarding the size limit in maintaining the 30,000 square feet.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that Mike Corbett raised the point that three small tenants should not be subject to the size limit of 30,000 square feet.

Mr. Thomas asked whether the Planning Board intended to regulate tenant size or every project that was over 30,000 square feet of gross retail floor area.

President Cook asked whether that should be a conditional use permit rather than a series of smaller tenants.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft believed that it should be a conditional use permit, because the large tenant could potentially have more impact on the surrounding neighborhood, in terms of traffic and other factors.

Mr. Thomas noted that the definition could be changed to "tenant floor area of 30,000 square feet or more requires a use permit."

President Cook noted that she was not swayed by the notion that because a use may have an existing planned development that the Planning Board should let it go. Mr. Thomas did not believe it should be "let go," but that it would be nonconforming; when any change would be brought to the Planning Board through a Planned Unit Development, it would be subject to the requirements.

President Cook inquired whether it would be significant to the City if a number of tenants consolidated the spaces into one big box-sized space. Board member Ezzy Ashcraft believed it would be significant.

Mr. Garrison stated that the City could, with some minor editing, add some language to the amendment to clarify that if a number of smaller tenants were to be consolidated to one large tenant over 30,000 square feet it would require a use permit.

Mr. Garrison noted that a 25% increase in floor area would be another trigger. Also, if the Planning Director determined there was a potential for substantial impacts, a Planned Development Amendment could be required. The City had the discretion under the existing PDA to say that the change from numerous small tenants to one large tenant may change the traffic dynamic substantially, and that a PDA may be required.

Mr. Thomas added that the City did not want a warehouse owner informing the City that a big box use would be moving in, and that the only discretion the City would have would be over the signage.

Vice President Kohlstrand agreed with staff's point that a lot of things slip through the cracks, and would like those issues to be dealt with as part of the PD, rather than putting another use permit on top of it. Mr. Thomas noted that would be possible.

Vice President Kohlstrand continued to say that the Planning Board was interested not only in the design, but also with operational considerations. Mr. Thomas agreed that was what Mr. Garrison had suggested,

Vice President Kohlstrand stated she would like the consolidation scenario to be a trigger for a use permit.

Mr. Garrison noted that the Alameda Towne Centre's existing entitlement contained triggers for a Planned Development Amendment, which were not written very clearly and contained some conflicting language. Staff's goal was to clarify those issues, and they planned to go beyond the Zoning Ordinance's PDA triggers with a higher level of specificity.

Mr. Thomas noted that there seemed to be consensus that staff should look at tenant space, and that 30,000 square feet would be the trigger. The Board members concurred.

Mr. Thomas requested the Board members' thoughts on whether there should be an exemption for historic buildings. Staff's recommendation was that if it were to be done, it should be for designated City monuments.

President Cook believed the conditional use permit allowed the City to preserve historical resources while maintaining a practical balance with the community.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that her major concern was if an applicant had to get a conditional use permit, that was one thing, but if they had to do a conditional use permit and a PD, that was another scenario. She did not want them to be subjected to both. Mr. Thomas responded that would not occur.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether a Home Depot would be considered for the Del Monte site, Mr. Thomas replied that they stated it was not in their plans. He added that staff supported retail, and that Del Monte had agreed not to do big box retail.

President Cook replied that she would like to see the PD changes before it went to Council.

Vice President Kohlstrand did not need to see the changes before it went to Council.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham whether the issue was time sensitive, Mr. Thomas replied that it was not time-sensitive.

Board member Cunningham noted that there was Board consensus that it be brought back under the Consent Calendar.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to continue this item to February 11, 2008, in order to revise and bring back for adoption the Large Format Retail Store Zoning Text Amendments with the revisions summarized by staff.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: 2 (Lynch, McNamara). The motion passed.

9-E. Appointment of Board Member as Representative on the Oakland Chinatown Advisory Committee. (AT)

Mr. Thomas noted that former Board member Mariani was the appointee, and Board member McNamara is the alternate representative. Board member McNamara agreed to become the designee.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she would be willing to serve as the alternate.

Board member Cunningham moved to nominate Board member McNamara to be the primary representative, and for Board member Ezzy Ashcraft to be the alternate representative.

Vice President Kohlstrand seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: 2 (Lynch, McNamara). The motion passed.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

a. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Point Advisory Task Force (Board Members Cook/Kohlstrand)

President Cook noted that there were no further meetings. She added that the packet included the presentations.

Mr. Thomas noted that it was a good meeting, and that SunCal received a great deal of extra information. Staff anticipated that they would request an extension on the schedule. They have concerns about the financial feasibility of the preliminary development concept, flooding, and a number of other issues. The community has expressed significant interest in a non-Measure A alternative. Their preliminary design concept is due by March.

- b. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member Mariani).

There was no report.

- c. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Vice President Kohlstrand).

There was no report.

- d. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Climate Protection Task Force (Board Member Cunningham).

Board member Cunningham noted that they came to consensus over what would be presented to the City Council. Mr. Thomas presented an update at the last meeting. Board member Cunningham noted that they rationalized and consolidated 30 recommendations to five recommendations:

1. Minimize waste/have a zero target for waste;
2. Introduce a Green Building Ordinance;
3. Examine alternative transportation methodologies within the City;
4. Promote education within the City, both within the schools and to the general public; and
5. Encourage AP&T to strive for 100% carbon-free power.

An additional recommendation was to set up a task force or committee as a regulatory body to review the implementation of the plan. Staff had recommended a two-year check-in. The Task Force disagreed, and wished to see more rigor to the review process; they would advise other Boards, similar to some of the other advisory boards in the community. This proposal would be brought before the City Council on February 5, 2008.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 10:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

This meeting was audio and video taped.